

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

**1033rd
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 11 October 1961,
at 10.30 a.m.



SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 9:

General debate (continued):

<i>Speech by Mr. Auguste (Haiti)</i>	<i>383</i>
<i>Speech by Mr. Louw (South Africa)</i>	<i>387</i>
<i>Statements by the representative of Liberia</i>	<i>395, 397</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Ethiopia</i>	<i>395</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Ghana</i>	<i>395</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Australia</i>	<i>396</i>
<i>Statement by the representative of Uruguay</i>	<i>397</i>

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) (translated from French): There are some repetitions which explain themselves and which we cannot easily avoid when they constitute a well-deserved tribute to fine qualities of heart and mind so rare today, to a happy and perfect balance of political and social man. I accordingly feel great personal satisfaction in conveying to you once again, Mr. President, the Haitian delegation's congratulations on your unanimous election as President of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly.
2. The lives of all of us, men and people, are a fabric of rich and varied emotions, some of which penetrate so deeply that at certain stages of life's great journey we have a desire to re-experience those that impelled us most strongly to question ourselves and look more closely at how we live. We seek them out, these strong emotions, like old and treasured things which we keep jealously stored away but which come to life again at a gesture, a spoken word. When they do, we feel once more the same shiver, the same great wave of emotion which seizes and penetrates us and shakes our very being. There are thus some memories which do not leave us easily, just as there are others which we like to evoke because they rouse our courage and help us rally our strength and energies when difficulties and disappointments make them flag and falter.
3. For eight long years, a man remarkable for his intelligence, for his humanitarianism, his great humanitarianism I should say, for his devotion in the face of every trial—endeavouring to find a solution to the difficult problems of the hour, whether of peace or under-development or of the great socio-political drama of the Africa of my fathers—directed this institution so dear to us all, the United Nations. His life, in a way, became identified with that of the Organization. For eight years he watched develop the thorny ideological rivalry that divides men and pits economic and social systems against one another. He was present at and took part in all the great trials

of the century that have taken place in this great tribunal of free thought—this United Nations. He was also our great and tireless traveller, giving of himself wherever difficulties appeared to demand his presence. With what enthusiasm he would do so, with what generosity he would expend himself to bring men closer together and to serve that sacred cause to which he devoted the last years of his life—the cause of peace.

4. For a long time to come his shade will remain among us, in the Secretariat of the United Nations, in the General Assembly and, above all, in the Security Council, where his anxieties and concern could often be read in the furrows of his brow and the sadness of his gaze. We shall always seem to hear his voice whenever we discuss the great problem which absorbed him in his capacity as Secretary-General of the United Nations, which preoccupied and tormented him and for which he can be said to have given his life—the problem of peace.

5. I confess I truly had moments of profound emotion in reading over the lengthy agenda which is submitted to us again this year and to which he had devoted his customary scrupulous care, for many of these questions can be reduced to the great common denominator of peace, the ultimate preoccupation of the world.

6. Anyone who leafs through the ledger of international life and attempts to strike a balance must truly find it difficult to express satisfaction at the panorama unfolding on the horizon, for, as some would say, the hour is full of surprises and heavy with sadness. But the great mourning that has gripped this Organization and, to some extent, each one of us, for Mr. Hammarskjöld was our Secretary-General, raises an important problem that we must solve—the problem of replacing him, but worthily and most speedily.

7. The most difficult problem, as you know, is not that of choosing a man able, by his great moral authority and ability, to command universal support. Important and difficult though it undoubtedly is, this problem of choosing a man, of appointing a Secretary-General, is nevertheless kept somewhat in the background and overshadowed by another and much more thorny problem—that of the reform of the office of Secretary-General, made more urgent than ever by the sudden, tragic death of Mr. Hammarskjöld.

8. Last year, through me, the Haitian delegation opposed the idea of handing over the direction, the executive power, of the United Nations to three Secretaries-General who would embody the famous policy of three blocs or tendencies—East, West and neutral. A year has elapsed and our position has not changed, since nothing has happened in the administrative conduct of this Organization to prove that this reform would serve a useful purpose. We continue, therefore, to believe that to change the office of

Secretary-General in the manner that has been proposed, replacing it by a triumvirate, would be an unfortunate innovation that would introduce more than anything else paralysis and even discord into the highest executive body.

9. In the past few months we have studied more attentively than ever before the machinery of this office and the personal activities of its incumbent. I must say that I have once again paid sincere tribute to the wisdom of those who, at San Francisco, surrounded the high office of Secretary-General with so many safeguards. Those men, who still had before their eyes the terrifying image of fascism, that modern-age survival of absolute power in the hands of one man, whether angel or genius, free of all restraints, did not wish to expose to the eternal weaknesses of human nature an international office of the greatest moral and political weight. For this reason, administratively as well as politically, the office of Secretary-General is merely that of a simple executant of the decisions made by the main organs of the United Nations. We continue to maintain, as we did last year, that the Secretary-General merely carries out the instructions that emerge from our deliberations, and we all know how freely and painstakingly those instructions are discussed. When the legislative functions as it does under this roof with that measure of objectivity which strengthens its freedom and gives authority and moral force to our discussions and our decisions, the Secretary-General, whoever he may be, cannot and will never be a man who acts as he wishes or imposes his views or those of the ideological group whose political and social beliefs he shares.

10. However, I have not merely observed the machinery of the office and the flexible and democratic operation of its administrative system. I have also, in the past few months, watched the man himself more closely and I have felt what some thinkers declare to be true—that in the life of any man who aspires to betterment there is value in objective and even vehement criticism. Piercing the Secretary-General's remarkable vigilance, one could sense in him a man who closely watched himself and his actions. We should therefore not hesitate to say that those who criticize with intent to harm are in error, for unknown to themselves they help us to do better, they teach us to observe ourselves and they do us better service than those so-called friends who lull us in idleness and indolence with their false and extravagant praise.

11. The office, then, is one of indisputable importance. It would be unfortunate if minor quarrels, creating difficulties that do our Organization no honour, were allowed to prolong this vacancy which has already existed too long.

12. I could have wished that this was the only shadow on the picture I have before me. Unfortunately, on every side the horizon is darkened by the densest clouds we have ever seen on earth. Today it is no longer merely a question of blaming this world to which we belong for the defects of an economic and social organization which is responsible in part for the poverty, ignorance and disease that are the lot of most of mankind. An affliction psychologically more terrible than physical privation has descended upon us all like a punishment. This affliction is fear, the fear engendered by the monstrous power of destruction deliberately employed for whatever purpose—whether boundless empire or self-defence.

13. Military power, or "striking force" as it is called in a certain parlance, and the terrifying means of destruction have failed in their purpose. They have not given man confidence in his material power to free himself from what is the most dreadful thing of all—fear. All of us, whoever we are, whether members of the atomic club or mere possessors of arsenals of conventional weapons, live in fear. We live in mounting fear of the very weapons we have forged; we drag out our existence and engage in mutual recriminations. Yet never has mankind desired or prayed for peace more fervently than today.

14. But, such is the irony of human affairs, for those who do not wish to go deeply into this fear psychosis, the ones who speak the most of peace are always those who seem to work the hardest against it, because it is they who arm themselves with the most monstrous means of destruction of which they boast with many accompanying threats, but which are also a definite expression of their policy of intimidation.

15. The arms race—far from giving man the feeling of invincible strength or of a certain military and destructive superiority that would give him, alas, the security which he desires and seeks but which he must for ever avoid like all false mirages—is developing in him increasingly the psychosis of fear. This is because, aware of the dreadful means of extermination which he has created and which he knows the enemy also possesses, he has reached the conclusion that in this crazed world any force which is not a monopoly loses all the protective value he had sought and thought he had found.

16. Because of this, the security which man would base on violence and the apocalyptic image of the destruction of which he is capable, but not on the firm foundation of the moral values, has disappeared entirely.

17. Surrounded by all the material attractions of modern life, he lives in anxiety and insecurity, and when, from this rostrum, he tries to wake our emotions, it is because in a sort of semi-lucidity and an apparent awakening of his conscience the spectre of the possible destruction of this planet by his evil genius pursues him like the eye of Cain.

18. Armaments have thus not given him the compensating factor he sought in the firm belief that the strength they personified could protect him by ensuring him a superiority that would shelter him against any possible destruction.

19. The fear in which we are living, all of us, great and small, is to be seen in the contradictory statements and attitudes of those who justify the theory of force by their terrifying threats and the resumption of nuclear tests heedless of the severity with which yesterday they condemned those who followed the bad example they had been set. And thus it is that radioactive fall-out is increasingly contaminating and poisoning the atmosphere, regardless of the motives that cause and disseminate it, whether madness, aberration or self-defence.

20. Those who act in this way can no longer delude us by trying to pose as friends or champions of mankind, despite all their grandiloquent declarations, for we all know that Hiroshima is now but a very little thing compared to the new version that is being prepared.

21. While man has advanced his scientific knowledge so greatly, jumping boldly through outer space, one day to reach other planets, his morality and conscience have not only not attained the same high level but seem in fact to have disappeared, victims of the saddest materialistic philosophy we have ever known.

22. Science would thus seem to have become the number one enemy of this planet if now, at last, there are some who, instead of using it exclusively to eradicate poverty and disease, dream of employing it to destroy in the twinkling of an eye the riches and treasure accumulated over the centuries through the stubborn toil of countless generations of men.

23. The profound anxiety which weighs upon the leaders of the world's great democracies and grips public opinion all over the world at the present time is undeniable proof that while armaments are undoubtedly a dangerous and terrifying bogey they have completely betrayed the hopes which the champions of the theory of terror had pinned on them as a means of achieving domination and conquest. To seek to cure the moral ills of mankind by violence and the sword is nothing more than charlatanism. If war, God forbid, were ever to engulf us, this time it would leave no one with the advantage of dictating an unconditional surrender, since it is virtually certain that we should all perish.

24. We are now standing at the crossroads. Only the other day, President Kennedy said from this rostrum that "the events and decisions of the next ten months may well decide the fate of man for the next ten thousand years". He went on to say:

"And we in this hall shall be remembered either as part of the generation that turned this planet into a flaming funeral pyre or as the generation that met its vow to 'save succeeding generations from the scourge of war'." [A/PV.1013, para. 94.]

25. When these words are spoken by the greatest Head of State of the free world, in the accents of a leader who is conscious of his heavy responsibilities but who has reflected deeply and will not retreat because the limits of what is possible have already been reached—when these words are spoken by a man who, in a gesture which should be remembered and which history will recall, made a voluntary step towards reconciliation in the search for peace by extending a fraternal hand to that other great leader, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, at Vienna, then, I confess, this means that we are truly, as I said just now, standing at the crossroads.

26. At this dangerous crossroads of our civilization, if we sincerely desire peace, there is one way, and only one way, open to us—that of disarmament, which could, as we all wish, be general and complete and which must submit to strict and honest international control. However, when disarmament has been talked about for so long, we may wonder why so many resolutions, conferences and commissions have succeeded one another to no avail. When we seek the reason for this, we perceive that distrust always sabotages the machinery installed and neutralizes the good intentions. In order to banish this distrust and to heal those who have been its victims, the persons concerned must decide to accept this international control as it has been so clearly defined in this hall, for it alone can regenerate that confidence which, it must be admitted, has not always been lost without

reason but without which we can do nothing and are rushing straight to destruction.

27. My country, militarily the weakest of this continent but morally one of the strong in the hour of torment since its only weapon is its unshakable Christian faith in Providence, hopes that the joint declaration by the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union will open the way to successful negotiations leading to general, complete and controlled disarmament. But obviously this is only a first step—a very important one, no doubt—that will lead the participants confidently to the conference table, but it is a step that all of us, and more especially those who have no arsenals or nuclear devices, must further by acting as the connecting link between East and West.

28. Our frank and measured language will, I am sure, surprise no one, for the Republic of Haiti, guided by the leader of its choice, faithful to its Christian beliefs but above all to the principles which constitute the strength of little States, has always honoured its international undertakings, thereby asserting its faith in the moral and spiritual values which alone give man added stature.

29. For us, the charters of the great international organizations are the Bibles that must guide us safely in the dark hours of travail which befall whomever they choose.

30. The two Charters to which we are signatories—the Charter of the United Nations and that of the Organization of American States—proclaim the same principles, profess the same faith in individual freedoms, condemn the same abuses against the human person and seek the same noble end—the deliverance of men and peoples from poverty, ignorance, disease and fear.

31. However, the Organization of American States, which came into being after the signing of the San Francisco Charter, at a time when certain apprehensions were beginning to emerge, seems to have been guided by the same motives which, in the age of colonial intercourse and of the ideas of the Holy Alliance, engendered the famous doctrine which proclaimed that American affairs should be dealt with preferably by Americans.

32. The reasons which lay behind the policy of our ancestors about the year 1823 seem to be the same as those that prompted the framers of the Charter of Bogotá. Since the same fears provoke the same reactions, the spirit of Bogotá, like the spirit of Monroe, seeks to prevent and preclude any and all interventions, to entrust the settlement of our disputes preferably to a regional organization.

33. America can carry out its own revolution, that is, it can bring about the changes that have to be made, destroy, for example, imperialism in whatever guise it presents itself and through whatever agent it operates, introduce a lofty social sense which does not unleash hatred or a sterile class struggle, but which, on the contrary, strengthens the cult of humanity among the sons of the same family and the same race for the sake of greater loyalty to the political testament of the fathers.

34. America, indeed, must carry out its own revolution, by which I mean that it must not import its revolution or take or copy it from another country, but must carry it out in the context of the American scene, the better to destroy poverty, illiteracy, ig-

norance, slums and disease which, as President François Duvalier once said, are the only enemies of my people and my Government and which any responsible leader of a social and political democracy has a duty to pursue relentlessly.

35. That is how we look at the problem in Haiti, under the realistic guidance of an executive and a legislature which constitutionally share power in dignity and mutual respect.

36. But it is clearly understood that America must carry out its revolution, though it must be a revolution which does not consist in changing one grief for another, one evil for another and perhaps greater evil. All that can be done without endangering American unity; indeed, it must be done if America is to be strong, prosperous and respected. Was it not to help us, the poor and less fortunate countries of the three Americas, to achieve this that President Kennedy pondered, felt and understood the urgency of the need for an Alliance for Progress? Was it not for that reason that we all met recently at the Punta del Este Conference?

37. When I speak of America, it is a little as though I were speaking of Haiti: my heart fills with emotion and I have a lump in my throat, for I ask myself continually—what does my country represent, what do Brazil, Paraguay and even the United States represent in a divided and weakened America? That is why, when difficulties arise between us, our duty is to meet together and, seated around the great family table, to find the words which will appease and reconcile.

38. But the problem which is especially close to our hearts is certainly not the gravest problem of the hour, the problem which most exercises the conscience of the world and increases international tension.

39. Fear, it is often said, does not always give rise only to acts of despair; it sometimes also succeeds in depriving man of all logic. For example, while self-determination is claimed for some, its grant to others is disputed and denied. One of the greatest contradictions of this kind is that engendered by the Berlin crisis, and this cannot be dissociated from the German problem as a whole.

40. In this world, merit and strength, as we have often learned, are individual and collective forces which cannot conceivably be disregarded, nor can they be stifled too long.

41. For a time it is perhaps possible to retard their development and fruition, but ultimately they always assert themselves and take their place in the sun. Quite plainly, the German problem is not one to be considered lightly, with minds responsive to the spontaneous surging of sympathy. But to proceed from there and suppose that measures condemned by all the evidence of history—that history which refers us from politics to sociology—can provide the proper solutions for the problem is to err greatly and is definitely, once again, to make no contribution to the cause of peace.

42. It has often been said that Germany twice dragged the world into a great adventure. But what strong and powerful countries are there that have never made war and do not cultivate the spirit of domination? What countries are there, when we review certain periods in the history of the colonized, occupied,

annexed, unhappy and martyred countries, that have nothing to reproach themselves for, unless their conscience is elastic or in shreds? Here, perhaps, more than anywhere else, applies the saying we all know well: "He that is without sin let him first cast a stone".

43. In disregarding the past, whether recent or remote, thereby showing that we have no wish to seek out the guilty and count those responsible, what we must tell ourselves is that at this moment in the twentieth century we all want to be the architects in the reconstruction of a new world.

44. We must therefore appeal to all moral, spiritual, economic and material values which are in accord with our views and principles, as enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

45. This world that we want to be better will not be better if we cultivate bitterness, with hate-filled words for those who have committed wrongs and errors in the past, errors such as we continue, alas, to see committed by those around us. Now, more than fifteen years after the greatest defeat any nation has ever known, the time has perhaps come to let the German people themselves freely decide their future. History, that record which cannot be falsified, is there to remind us all that dismemberments, annexations, sub-divisions and corridors have always been fatal to the cause of peace.

46. We should like to extend these considerations also to all our unfortunate African brothers who, arms in hand, are waging the great struggle which we, too, have waged in the past. The drama of Algeria, among others, fighting heroically for its independence for eight years, is one of the most doleful pages in the history of contemporary colonial wars. But Algeria, we are sure, will before long be a free and independent State which will make a valuable contribution to our work. What we wish, both for Algeria and for General de Gaulle who has so intelligently understood the colonial problem, and the Algerian drama in particular, is that both sides should turn the page and allow the two States to consider, in dignity and mutual respect, what their future relations are to be. We would also wish that those who cling to outworn ideas and systems should learn the lesson afforded by the collapse of all these colonial empires and bring intelligence and understanding to bear on the problems of Angola and South Africa, so as to find solutions for them that will accord with the resolutions which have been adopted here and to which they must submit.

47. A great date was inscribed in our annals last week when, at our 1018th meeting, we invited Sierra Leone, the youngest Member of our Organization, to take its seat among us. Africa is still the centre of honour and we of Haiti are particularly proud of this. It is this pride, added to the good wishes of the Haitian people and Government, for whom I am now speaking, that I would ask the worthy representatives of this young sister State to convey to their Government and to the people of Sierra Leone.

48. However, the interest we all have in Africa cannot be limited to mere polite words and compliments. Over the past few years our Organization has seen its membership increase by more than 40 per cent. In this the African States have made the richest contribution in numbers and quality. They are all congenial, intelligent, displaying great personality despite their youth, and their sense of values

is shown by their ardent and legitimate desire to take an active part in the important work of the United Nations organs. For this reason the geographical distribution of seats ought to be expanded so as to enable them, here too, to make a constructive and vital contribution to our work. My delegation hopes that the structure of the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council may be revised as soon as possible in order to enable them to sit beside us on a basis of strict numerical equality. We would also hope that the system of the veto, the spirit of which is becoming distorted, may be re-examined at the appropriate time with a view to rescuing it once and for all from the abuse to which it is subjected and from blackmail.

49. The regular session of an Organization such as ours is undoubtedly an important period in international life and in the conscience of all who, invested with the confidence of their Governments, take part in it.

50. Like those great rendezvous in the realm of the spirit, it, too, is a sort of stage, a halting place in the progress of political man, who stops to cross-examine himself so as to do better and scans the horizon like the helmsman, tiller in hand, who knows he is responsible for many human lives. A session is thus in some manner a sort of private conversation between man and himself. It is also an opportunity for us to study men by discussing problems with them, to hear ourselves opposed and thus rid ourselves of the dogma of infallibility in which we believe so naively. For the man who thinks and reflects, for the man in the street, for young people—for them, too, a session is a great thing. That is why all eyes are on us, some anxious, some discouraged, yet others full of the great illusions of this life, but all transmitting the same prayer, imploring us to see to it that through our deliberations peace is restored to us.

51. Let us grapple with this task to the best of our ability and pray to God to help us make this sixteenth session a fruitful one; let us do our best to justify the confidence of those who sent us here to plead the cause of man, that he may be freed from hunger, disease, poverty, ignorance and fear.

52. Mr. LOUW (Republic of South Africa): Before addressing the Assembly and in exercising my right of reply, I wish to refer to a statement made by the Foreign Minister of Ghana when he participated in this debate on 26 September. He alleged that an official document of the United Nations had not been allowed to enter South Africa. He said:

"... the Government of ... South Africa has now embarked upon a policy to undermine the authority and prestige ... of the United Nations ... and has started to classify certain types of United Nations documents, which are unpalatable to them, as 'objectionable literature'." [1015th meeting, para. 72.]

He then referred to a speech made by President Nkrumah on 23 September 1960, and he went on to say:

"This speech of President Nkrumah appears in document A/PV.869, in the Official Records of the United Nations."

"Any person in ... South Africa ... who is found in possession of a copy of this official document of the United Nations, which contains President Kwame Nkrumah's speech, is liable to ... imprisonment ..." [Ibid., paras. 72 and 73.]

53. It will be noted that the Foreign Minister of Ghana specifically refers to an "official document" of which he also quoted the official number, that is, A/PV.869.

54. To make it quite plain to the Assembly what he had in mind, the Foreign Minister then proceeded:

"This is the first time that an official document of the United Nations which contains a statement made by a representative of a Member State has been treated by the Government of another Member State with such contempt." [Ibid., para. 74.]

He went further, and stated:

"... the delegation of Ghana will insist that the General Assembly should consider whether, in the circumstances ... South Africa should not be expelled from membership of the United Nations." [Ibid., para. 75.]

55. Mr. President, you will, I am sure, agree that this is a very serious charge, particularly coming from the Foreign Minister of a Member State. I was quite certain that false information had been given to the Assembly, but I nevertheless cabled to South Africa for full information.

56. What are the facts? I have received the document which was sent to South Africa by the Ghanaian Information Office, and which has been falsely represented as being an official document of the United Nations.

57. May I repeat the statement made from this rostrum by the Foreign Minister of Ghana. He said, inter alia:

"This speech of President Kwame Nkrumah appears in document A/PV.869, in the Official Records ..."

"Any person in ... South Africa ... who is found in possession ... of this official document of the United Nations ... is liable to imprisonment ..." and so on. [Ibid., paras. 72 and 73.]

Later in his speech he said, I would remind you again:

"This is the first time that an official document of the United Nations ... has been treated by the Government of another Member State with such contempt." [Ibid., para. 74.]

58. There can therefore not be the least possible doubt that the Foreign Minister of Ghana was untruthfully informing the Assembly that an "official document" of the United Nations had been barred from entering South Africa. I have here what the Foreign Minister of Ghana described as an "official document A/PV.869 of the United Nations". It is a booklet inscribed as follows: "Issued by the Permanent Mission of Ghana to the United Nations, 144 East 44th Street, New York 17 ...". This document is nothing more than a reprint in English and in French of Mr. Nkrumah's speech before the General Assembly, with his photograph on the front page, and issued by the Ghanaian delegation. In view of the attacks and the vilification of South Africa in that speech, this booklet was naturally and correctly classified as objectionable literature by the South African customs authorities.

59. I also have here the official document, A/PV.869, to which the Foreign Minister of Ghana referred. As can be seen, it is something entirely different. This official document has at no time been barred from entering South Africa.

60. It is difficult to believe that anyone holding the position of Foreign Minister of his country could make a statement to this Assembly which is devoid of all truth, and which, as leader of his delegation, he should have known was a fabrication. The Foreign Minister of Ghana owes this Assembly an apology for this attempt to mislead his fellow delegates.

61. I hope that after I have completed this statement which I am about to make, the Foreign Minister of Ghana will come to this rostrum and apologize to the South African Government, and to my delegation, for these untrue and insulting allegations. It is this sort of conduct which, to use his own words, is likely "to undermine the authority and prestige ... of the United Nations ..." [Ibid., para. 72.]

62. The sixteenth session of the General Assembly opened with the United Nations facing the most crucial test of its chequered career. The world is in a state of turmoil and many people are living in fear. There are trouble spots in many parts of the world, the most dangerous being the Berlin situation which has become linked with uncontrolled nuclear testing. The prospects of securing disarmament are daily receding into the background.

63. To add to this state of international tension there came the tragic death of the Secretary-General, which gave an impetus to the campaign launched last year against Mr. Hammarskjöld personally by the Soviet Union and its satellite States. After his death, attempts were immediately made to exploit this tragic event for the purpose of creating geographical and particularly ideological differences in the United Nations Secretariat. The Soviet delegations are continuing in this campaign and no settlement is as yet in sight.

64. The peoples of many countries are asking where and how the United Nations fits into this somewhat depressing and dismal picture. They want to know what has happened to the lofty sentiments and the noble purposes set out in Chapter I of the Charter.

65. What does the record of the past fifteen years show? Instead of "harmonizing the actions of nations" and achieving "international co-operation", the annual sessions of the General Assembly very soon became battlegrounds for conflicting national interests and rival ideologies. The annual sessions provided opportunities for international intrigue and for the formation of racial, geographical and ideological blocs. Not content with an East-West rivalry, a so-called third force seems to be in process of establishment. All this is a far call from the injunction of the Charter to harmonize the actions of nations. Delegations give prior consideration to their own national interests, or to the interests of the group to which they belong, rather than judging issues on their merits. Caucus meetings of the different groups or blocs have assumed greater importance than meetings of the Assembly or the different Committees.

66. The purposes and ideals set out in the Preamble to the Charter and in Chapter I are relegated to the background, and delegations are increasingly interfering in the domestic affairs of Member States, generally for the purpose of serving their own selfish ends.

67. There are Member States which, at meetings of the General Assembly and elsewhere, pose as the champions of human rights and human dignity, but which close their eyes to the fact that these principles are not honoured in their own countries. Among these

are the delegations of the Soviet Union and its satellite countries, which conveniently ignore conditions existing in Hungary and in the Soviet Union's occupied or colonial territories. So, also, they strongly urge the right of self-determination, provided it is applied only to territories which are not under their control. They vigorously protest when an attempt is made to apply the principle of self-determination to the millions who are living in Soviet-dominated countries, or when the right of self-determination is claimed by the Naga people or the Sikhs in India. So much for the political conditions obtaining in this Organization,

68. No organization, political or otherwise, can hope to survive if its financial position is unsound. The last financial report issued by the late Secretary-General revealed an unsatisfactory state of affairs. This was recently summarized and commented upon by one of the world's best-known newspapers, The Times of London, which, in an authoritative article, described the United Nations as bordering on bankruptcy. I cannot do better than to quote from that interesting article. The writer, who is the United Nations correspondent of The Times of London, opens his article with this question: "How long can the United Nations go on supporting its military operations in the Congo ... without going bankrupt?". After pointing out that, at the time of writing, the Congo and Middle East Emergency Forces were costing \$140 million per year, which is more than twice the United Nations normal annual budget, the writer asks: "How can the Organization hope to extricate itself from this extraordinary expenditure?". He adds that already a considerable number of States are in arrears of their annual payments. He points out that with the exception of South Africa, the twentieth-six African States together contribute only 2 1/4 per cent of their annual budget. He could also have pointed out, had he had the information at the time, that on the normal United Nations budget the total arrears exceed \$83 million, and that for the maintenance of the United Nations Force in the Suez the arrears amount to approximately \$21 million. About seventy States are in arrears of their contributions to the Congo adventure.

69. The writer dismisses the suggestion of internal economies, which he says "would not make the difference between solvency and bankruptcy". He deals with the suggestion of tiding us over the trouble by raising loans from banks and from financial institutions, but he does not find that suggestion very helpful. He writes: "To keep going, the United Nations has been borrowing from its working capital, its Special Fund and its Children's Fund (UNICEF)". I wonder if representatives here appreciate what is going on.

70. The writer in The Times of London suggests remedial action, such as "liquidating both its Congo and Middle East operations". Another suggestion, he says, is "to divide the normal budget into Secretariat expenses," on the one hand, to which all Members would continue to contribute and, on the other hand, operational expenses, "to be financed by those Members who favoured them, and were willing to pay for them". He concludes with this statement: "The United Nations cannot be kept going for many more months at its present rate of income and expenditure, without becoming bankrupt. When the General Assembly meets on 19 September"—this article was written early in September—"it will be confronted with the urgent need to scale down the Congo operation. After October the operation may have to be wound up".

71. I may mention that, in dealing with unnecessary and what one might call fruitless expenditure incurred by the United Nations, the writer in The Times of London did not refer to the cost incurred by Mr. Fabregat's party, which attempted to enter South West Africa illegally and, after having been thwarted in that attempt, proceeded to wander about the rest of the African continent—at United Nations expense.

72. The writer of the article from which I have just quoted is particularly concerned about the alarming financial aspect of United Nations action in the Congo—and so, I am sure, are delegations here. When this matter was discussed at the special session of the General Assembly last year, I warned against precipitate action. The history of the United Nations actions in the Congo is not a happy one, and no one knows where it is going to end.

73. Recently, there has also been the action taken by the United Nations Forces against President Tshombé of Katanga. Conditions in Katanga have been relatively stable, both politically and economically. Instead of appreciating those conditions, the United Nations military forces, acting under the Security Council resolution of 21 February 1961,^{1/} swooped down on Katanga, thereby creating those very conditions which the Organization was supposed to prevent.

74. At last year's special session, I stated from this rostrum that, quite apart from the doubts which existed as to whether action taken by the United Nations, primarily for the purpose of restoring internal order, was in all respects justified, there was the important question whether the United Nations had the right to intervene in the internal conflicts of the Congo or in political conditions in the Congo, as provided for in the resolution before the Assembly last year. I said at that time: "This raises the further question as to whether the type of State which will eventually emerge in the Congo is any concern of this Organization". [862nd meeting, para. 120.] I referred to the fact that the leaders of Katanga had expressed the desire to have a different constitutional arrangement, and I then said:

"This surely is a matter for the Congolese themselves, whose decision, I submit, should not be influenced either by resolutions of this Organization or by the actions of this Organization or any other State." [Ibid.]

That was the view which I expressed on behalf of the South African delegation more than a year ago. That is still our view, which has been justified and further strengthened by recent events in Katanga.

75. Military action was obviously taken for the purpose of forcing a political arrangement on the people of Katanga, and, incidentally, securing the mineral wealth of the Province. It was not taken for the purpose of maintaining order, and is thus in conflict with the Security Council resolution of 21 February 1961 which, inter alia, expressed the conviction that "the solution of the problem of the Congo lies in the hands of the Congolese people themselves without any interference from outside".

76. As I have said, conditions in Katanga have been relatively stable, both politically and economically. As a result of orders, for which Mr. O'Brien may,

or may not, have been responsible, military action was taken, action which I am personally inclined to describe as aggression, with resultant conditions of chaos.

77. When I spoke on this matter on 19 September 1960 [862nd meeting, para. 122], I said that South Africa reserved its position with regard to expenditure to be incurred in the Congo. I now give formal notice that South Africa is not prepared to contribute to the expenditure already incurred, or to be incurred, by the United Nations in the Congo.

78. In that connexion may I remind the Assembly that the Republic of South Africa—unlike a number of other members of this Organization—is not in arrears either with the payment of its annual dues to the United Nations, or with its contribution to the upkeep of the United Nations troops in Suez.

79. May I say, in passing, that my Government has serious doubts as to whether the United Nations Force should continue to be maintained in the Suez area. It is surely not intended that it should be kept there indefinitely, and for all time. I would add that, in view of the difficult financial situation now facing this Organization, the time would seem to have come when those who favour projects entailing extraordinary expense should also be willing to pay for them, and not merely to vote for them in the Assembly.

80. As the representative of an African State, I naturally would like to review the African scene. What is happening in this vast continent, which occupies the strategic position of being situated between the West and the East?

81. The outstanding feature of events in Africa has been the large number of African territories that have attained independence during the past two or three years. At the beginning of 1958 there were only three independent States in Africa. Today there are twenty-eight—and more are to follow.

82. While the attainment of full national independence is a matter for congratulation, the question must inevitably arise whether the country concerned is ready or able to assume the responsibilities of independent statehood. The question has arisen, and will arise again, in connexion with the Soviet item on the agenda calling for a time-table for independence for all dependent countries—except, of course, their own occupied territories.

83. In August of last year no less a person than Sir Abubakar Balewa, the Prime Minister of Nigeria, stated in a television interview here in New York:

"I do not believe Africa's Non-Self-Governing territories will benefit from the immediate granting of independence. I don't think there are enough trained people to man the civil service."

Sir Abubakar speaks from experience. Under the system of "colonial oppression", as it is sometimes termed, the British not only prepared his country for independence, but were good enough on their departure to leave a large number of civil servants and technicians to assist Nigeria during the first years of independence.

84. In view of this statement, one wonders whether the Prime Minister of Nigeria approves of the high-handed action of the United Nations in arresting and deporting European civil advisers of President Tshombé of Katanga, who was anxious—as were the Governments

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1961, document S/4741.

of Ghana and Nigeria—to retain the services of trained advisers for the purpose of ensuring the continuation of the stable economic conditions which have prevailed almost ever since the United Nations General Assembly decided to take action in the Congo.

85. Mr. Iain McLeod, the new Leader of the British House of Commons, who certainly cannot be described as being antagonistic to the aspirations of the Africans, recently stated: "There is considerable anxiety about the pace of events in Africa . . . I share these anxieties. I think that the pace of events in Africa, and elsewhere in the Colonial Territories, is dangerously fast".

86. The leaders of the anti-colonial campaign here in the United States, in Europe and also in the General Assembly, laboured under the mistaken impression that the parliamentary system of government, born in Britain and adopted by other Western countries, including the United States of America, could be grafted on to the traditional customs and practices of the African peoples—or, shall I say, transplanted to the alien soil of age-old African tradition. It simply does not work that way. One reason is that the masses in many African countries are still illiterate, and in some cases are told to vote for a symbol, for instance, an animal, printed on the voting paper. In any case, even the educated Africans do not appear to be interested in, or are not enamoured of, the Western system of political parties that compete with each other for the governing of the country. It is a foreign plant that will not thrive on African soil. This system has recently been criticized by Sobhuza II, the Paramount Chief of the British-protected Swazis; also by Mr. Chimpembere, one of the Nyasaland leaders.

87. Mr. John Tettegah, the Secretary-General of the Ghana Trade Union Congress, was equally emphatic when he told a gathering in Ghana in December last:

"Africa does not need a Westminster-type parliamentary system, in which two or more political parties compete with each other for authority . . . Africa cannot afford to accept foreign systems which are incompatible with the African way of life, thought and practice."

In speaking thus, Mr. Tettegah was echoing the sentiments of his leader, Dr. Nkrumah, who, soon after achieving independence, rid himself of an effective parliamentary opposition, and further threw overboard the democratic principles which had been preached in Ghana by a succession of British administrators and governors. Only about ten days ago further steps were taken to convert Ghana to an authoritarian State. The ruler of Ghana is flirting with Moscow and Peking. Guinea, soon after being given its independence, promptly became a disciple of Moscow. Mali appears to be going the same way, and others are likely to follow. The Congo (Leopoldville)—not Brazzaville—may well be the next. In past years, when the United States and other Western delegations were taking the lead in attacking colonialism, and urging the African States to become independent, they little thought that they were securing further recruits for Moscow and Peking.

88. As I shall show later in my address, South Africa has profited by the mistakes made by some of the colonial Powers, and in its Bantu legislation is building up a system of self-government for the different Bantu ethnic groups, which, while observing democratic principles, takes account of Bantu tradition and custom.

89. Let us take a look at my country. The first thing that strikes one is that, "while there is unrest and turmoil in several other African countries—from what used to be the United Arab Republic and from Ethiopia in the north, and Ghana in the west, to Northern Rhodesia in the middle-south—quiet conditions prevail in South Africa, in spite of strenuous efforts by subversive elements in London, New York, Accra and Cairo, acting in concert with subversive elements in South Africa, to stir up trouble in the Republic. The activities of these organizations and of expatriate Bantu agitators has had little influence on the South African Bantu, who prefers satisfactory social conditions and economic progress.

90. In connexion with this matter of the economic position, I should like to mention that a recent dispatch in a leading New York newspaper from its representative in Johannesburg, supposedly based on a speech by the Minister of Economic Affairs of South Africa, not only gives a false impression of that speech but also gives a distorted picture of South Africa's economic condition. This particular reporter is in the habit of sending biased dispatches from South Africa.

91. In common with certain other Western countries South Africa has experienced a drop in its exchange and currency reserves. In order to forestall a further drop, it was decided to exercise the right of members to draw on the International Monetary Fund. As is usual in such cases, permission was granted to draw one-half of the requested amount immediately. It is known to us that an influential member of the Fund later expressed doubts as to whether alleged conditions in South Africa would justify permission to draw the second half—or "tranche", as it is called—at a later date. It gives me pleasure to inform the Assembly and particularly those who were inclined to have doubts about South Africa's political and economic stability, that it has not been necessary to draw even the first "tranche", owing to the progressive increase in our currency reserves and because of South Africa's basically sound economic position.

92. According to United Nations statistics, the annual per caput income of the South African Bantu alone—that is, apart from the Coloureds and Indians—has, during the five years from 1953 to 1958, increased by more than 64 per cent. Those are United Nations statistics. This increase is progressively being maintained. The Bantu is living in a well-laid-out Bantu township, in a neat home, provided with the necessary amenities, electric light, drinking water, satisfactory sanitary arrangements.

93. Judging from an article in yesterday afternoon's New York World-Telegram, we in South Africa have reason to be satisfied with the manner in which the needs of our non-White workers are attended to. The children of the Bantu receive both primary and secondary education, and the elders of his community draw old-age pensions at the end of each month.

94. Medical and social services are provided for the physically unfit. In respect of social and medical services, housing and education, South Africa, per caput of its non-White population, spends considerably more than any other State on the whole of the continent of Africa—approximately five to six times more.

95. This particularly applies to health services. The Baragwanath Hospital, which serves the Bantu and Coloured population only of Johannesburg and its

environs, is the largest and best equipped on the Continent of Africa, and in fact ranks among the best in the world. There are 46 wards and 10 operating theatres. Beds are available for 2,500 patients. The hospital is served by 182 full-time medical doctors, of whom half are specialists. At present 15 of them are Bantu doctors, and this number is being progressively increased. There are 1,000 Bantu nurses, and all the ward sisters are Bantu.

96. Six hundred thousand Bantu out-patients receive medical attention annually. No African country can boast of anything nearly approaching a hospital of this size, which serves the non-Whites of only one of South Africa's large cities. There are large hospitals for non-Whites also in many other centres, particularly the huge Edward VIII Hospital at Durban.

97. These facts are, of course, never disclosed by South Africa's enemies and critics. The totally false impression is given, again in the course of the present general debate, that the non-Whites in South Africa are ill-treated and oppressed, and that they have to be "saved" by the United Nations.

98. I have said that the non-Whites in South Africa share in the growth and prosperity of the country. I have also indicated the extent to which the needs of the Bantu are being attended to by way of housing, social and medical services.

99. But South Africa's growth and the advanced state of its industrialization could also be of great benefit to the emergent African States. In support of this contention, I quote a statement made on 20 August last by Mr. Tom Mboya, the African leader in Kenya. After violently attacking South Africa because of what he termed "South Africa's policy of racial discrimination", he said:

"With its high degree of industrialization, technical progress, manpower, resources and materials, South Africa could have been a pillar of the new and independent Africa. The emergent nations of Africa would have looked to South Africa as a sister nation, before anyone else, for aid and guidance."

Not only has Mr. Mboya correctly described what South Africa has achieved, but I fully endorse his opinion that the new States of Africa could look to South Africa for substantial aid and for guidance in regard to industrial, scientific and other matters—provided, of course, that the African States wish to make use of that aid.

100. I myself, in my capacity as Foreign Minister, and also the present and previous Prime Ministers of my country, have in the past expressed our real desire to co-operate with other African States in matters of common concern and to give advice and practical assistance where necessary, as indeed we have frequently done through the medium of the CCTA, the Council for Technical Co-operation, and FAMA, the Foundation for Mutual Assistance in Africa South of the Sahara, which is a body for giving mutual assistance.

101. On many occasions, and again this year, we have willingly acceded to requests from African States and territories to supply vaccines and other remedies for animal diseases from the world famous Onderstepoort Veterinary Research Institute. We have done so also in cases where the African country concerned has taken up an actively hostile attitude towards South Africa.

102. South Africa has played a leading part in the CCTA, and yet at the Abidjan Conference this year, several African delegates demanded South Africa's expulsion from that body. We are a founder member of that body. One of the delegates even walked out whenever a South African delegate participated in the discussions. Similar hostility to the South African delegation was shown at the Conference of the Economic Commission for Africa which was held at Addis Ababa.

103. On the other hand, where certain South African countries have taken measures to boycott imports from South Africa we have not retaliated and their exports are still freely admitted to South Africa.

104. Mr. Tom Mboya is quite right, South Africa can give aid and guidance to other African countries, and is willing to do so, as we have done in the past. What, then, is his reason for declining assistance from South Africa?

105. I have already referred to the reason which he gave in the first part of his statement, namely what he called South Africa's policy of racial discrimination. May I say that African leaders who, I am sure, keep in touch with happenings in other parts of the world, are, of course, aware of the fact that colour and racial discrimination are practised in certain Western and also in certain Eastern countries that are Members of this Organization.

106. The reply is generally: "Yes, but in those countries discrimination and segregation are not sanctioned by law, as in the case of South Africa". Leaving aside for the moment the question whether South Africa's policy of differentiation and separate development is the same as discrimination and segregation practised in other countries, that reply offers little comfort to the non-Whites in those countries who are the victims of racial discrimination and segregation. Does it help them in any way if the central government of a particular country frowns against racial discrimination, while it is sanctioned and not prohibited by municipal, provincial and state authorities of that country? Have the leaders of the African delegations in this Assembly taken note of this "unofficial" type of racial segregation?

107. And what about the almost criminal neglect of the needs of small non-White communities in certain Western countries? Why pick on South Africa? Are there perhaps political and particularly economic and financial considerations which induce the leaders of African States to close their eyes to the actual practice of colour discrimination as well as religious, caste and other forms of discrimination, in certain countries, while threatening sanctions against South Africa? I want to inform the Assembly, as I did on a previous occasion, that never in the history of the Union of South Africa, now the Republic of South Africa, has there ever yet been a single instance of organized attacks by Whites on non-Whites. Again I ask, why pick on South Africa?

108. The main complaint is that the large non-White majority does not share full political equality with the Whites, that the principle of "one man one vote" is not applied. It is not seriously contended by our critics and enemies that the non-Whites in South Africa are oppressed—they say so, but they do not seriously mean it—or that their material needs, housing, social services and education, are not attended to. On the contrary, as I have pointed out, in these respects far more is done in South Africa for the

Bantu and other non-Whites than in any other State in the whole African continent.

109. In order to appreciate the position in South Africa, the following basic facts must be borne in mind.

110. First, the White population of South Africa is a permanent one whose ancestors came to the country more than three hundred years ago. We are not "colonists", as is so often erroneously alleged. We cannot return to the countries of our forefathers. We are strangers in those countries, just as the Roosevelts, the Eisenhowers, the Diefenbakers and the Vanderbilts are today strangers in the countries of their forebears.

111. Secondly, the Bantu, or black, peoples of South Africa are not the original inhabitants of the country. Their ancestors moved southwards from East and Central Africa and crossed the Limpopo River at about the same time as the original Dutch settlers arrived at the Cape. At that time the only inhabitants of the southern end of Africa were nomadic groups of Hottentots and Bushmen. The Bantu living in South Africa today, therefore, have no greater claim to the southern end of the African continent than the White population.

112. Thirdly, as was correctly stated by Mr. Tom Mboya, South Africa is today a highly developed and industrialized country—the most highly industrialized country on the continent of Africa. This was accomplished against tremendous odds with considerable sacrifices, and by the initiative of South Africans of European descent. By providing the necessary labour, non-Whites contributed their share to the development of the country.

113. Fourthly, the White population of South Africa is now being told by African countries and by some of the Asian countries, and also by the delegations of certain Western countries, that what has been built up over three centuries by their forebears and by successive generations of White South Africans, must be placed under the control of the non-White majority. That will be the logical consequence of the demand for full political equality in the same State. But then I would add, there can be full political equality if each of the races in the State is to have its own separate political development, which is the policy of the present Government.

114. Would the United States of America, Canada, the Latin American countries—all countries whose respective early histories of colonization are similar to that of South Africa—be prepared, if their relative proportions of White to non-White populations were the same as in South Africa, to hand over the control of their countries to Negro or to Indian majorities? That, I think, is a pertinent question which demands an answer.

115. Why is it that certain Western countries with large White populations are taking steps to limit the quotas of non-White immigrants? Is it because in those countries racial friction has already manifested itself and they are taking timely precautions to prevent the extension of such friction? Are they perhaps worried about the formation of racial political blocs or pressure groups, particularly in the larger centres? I do not for a moment criticize those countries for taking timely precautions. But then they, and particularly their Press and some of their clerics, should not criticize and attack South Africa for taking similar

precautions, and for far more valid and far more urgent reasons.

116. Let me remind our critics and enemies that if the system of differentiation practised in South Africa is to be regarded as discrimination, then it is practised also against the White population. Whites are not allowed to enter the Bantu residential areas without permits; they enjoy no trading rights in Bantu townships. Similarly, Whites are debarred from land ownership in the Bantu homelands or territories and they are not permitted to participate in the Bantu Authorities. Eventually Whites will be barred from trading in the Bantu homelands.

117. There is discrimination equally against the Whites in so far as concerns the Black territories, the Native territories.

118. What exactly is South Africa's policy of apartheid which has become almost a swearword in many countries? How many of those who attack South Africa and who attacked South Africa again in the course of this general debate, how many of those—and those who are threatening to apply sanctions—have any conception as to what our policy is? Few know that the word apartheid is in fact an abbreviated form of "aparte ontwikkeling", which means separate development, with emphasis on the word "development".

119. This policy has been cruelly, and, I may add, maliciously misrepresented in Press dispatches which have been appearing in the newspapers of many countries over a number of years. It is on the basis of those malicious misrepresentations that these attacks are based. I dealt fully with this aspect of the anti-South African campaign when I addressed the Assembly last year, and I do not intend to repeat what I said on that occasion; I leave it at that.

120. South Africa's policy of separate development is not, as is generally supposed, the creation of the present Government. When speaking from this rostrum two years ago [811th meeting, para. 34], I quoted from a speech delivered by General Smuts, one of the founders of the United Nations, more than forty years ago, in which he referred to "the practice that has grown up in South Africa of giving the natives"—the Bantu—"their own separate institutions on parallel lines". General Smuts went on to say in a speech delivered in London:

"It is useless to try to govern black and white in the same system ... In land-ownership and forms of government our policy is to keep them apart"—apartheid—"... Thus in South Africa you will eventually have large areas cultivated by blacks and governed by blacks, while in the rest of the country you will have whites who will govern themselves according to accepted European principles."

121. The policy of separate development, also known as apartheid, is thus clearly the traditional policy of South Africa. It is not a new creation and is not as is generally alleged, the evil conception of the present Government and particularly of the present Prime Minister, Dr. Verwoerd. It is a policy which is equally in the interests of the White and of the Bantu population. It is intended to safeguard what has been built up over three centuries by the Whites, and at the same time to take account of the political aspirations, as well as of the traditions, cultures, and also the material needs of the Bantu peoples.

122. The Bantu Self-Government Act provides for progressively increased legislative, judicial and ad-

ministrative powers for the Bantu authorities in their own territories. There are huge territories reserved only for use and occupation by the Bantu. These territories, mostly situated in some of the most fertile areas of South Africa, were voluntarily occupied by the Bantu which, at the time of the arrival of the first Dutch immigrants, were themselves migrating, as I said, from East and Central Africa. These territories were subsequently reserved for the Bantu only. Not only are the laws excluding White occupation strictly applied, but huge tracts of adjacent land have subsequently been acquired by expropriating the White owners and being handed over to the Bantu. The Bantu Self-Government Act avoids the mistakes made in other parts of Africa of over-hasty growth and of creating independent territories which are not yet ripe for self-government.

123. By this legislation eight Bantu national units are established on an ethnic basis, and provision is made for the corresponding Bantu authorities. Experience in South Africa and elsewhere in Africa has shown that the splitting or the mixing of ethnic groups leads to clashes and internecine warfare.

124. Under this system of self-government, the Bantu have since 1951 increased their governing Councils from about sixty, with about 300 individual members, to 445 councils with no less than 6,550 individual members in 1961. This shows that the system is not only democratic, but also that it has been well received by the Bantu in spite of attempts by subversive organizations and by White agitators to discredit this policy and to create unrest.

125. South Africa's policy is not, as is sometimes alleged, one of "back to the tribe" or "back to the bush". The object is to start with a system of government which is based on Bantu custom and tradition and which will be further developed by the progressive introduction of fully representative self-government.

126. I do not want to quote the testimonies—it would take too much time—but I would mention that the under-mentioned leaders of Bantu Territorial Authorities have in public statements during the past year or more signified their unqualified acceptance of the Government's policy of separate development and have also expressed their appreciation of what is being done to develop self-government in the different Bantu ethnic areas. They are: Chief Botha Sigeau, Presiding Territorial Chief of the Transkeian Territorial Authority; Chief M. C. Chuene, Chairman of the Pietersburg Regional Authority; Regent P. M. Shilubane, of the Banuna Tribal Authority; Cyprian Bhekuzulu, Paramount Chief of the Zulus, a well-known Bantu race; Paramount Chief Victor Poto, of Western Pondoland.

127. Among the most interesting of these testimonies is that which came from the leader of the Bantu in Ovamboland, in South West Africa, who stated in August of last year:

"The Ukuanyama"—the name of these people—"have never been betrayed by the Union Government and have retained their country intact. This applies to the whole of Ovamboland and after forty years under Union administration the vast majority of the people are content that it should continue, despite agitation for changes from small and unrepresentative sections at home and abroad."

This testimony, this statement, coming from the outstanding leader of Ovamboland in South West

Africa, is an effective reply to Mr. Fabregat and his fellow-members of the Committee on South West Africa who have been grievously misled by a small group of agitators from South West Africa.

128. Earlier in my address, I quoted from statements by African leaders to show that the Western system of parliamentary government simply cannot be transplanted to the African soil. This is further proved by the testimony of the Bantu leaders to which I have referred. We in South Africa, with our experience and knowledge of Bantu life and traditions extending over a period of more than 200 years, have always realized that fact, which is the basis of the policy we have evolved, and which will eventually give to our Bantu fellow citizens in their respective homelands full self-government in accord with their own customs and traditions, and which is best suited to their own outlook, culture and temperament.

129. A Bantu Industrial Development Corporation has been created for the establishment of industries in those areas. The Government of the Republic is providing the initial capital and will continue to assist financially. These industries will ultimately be wholly owned and controlled by the Bantu themselves. I wish to emphasize—and this is an important point—that these industries will not, as in the case of some of the African territories, be controlled by financial interests operating from other countries that pocket the profits and at the same time detract from the political independence of those States.

130. Industries are also being established near the borders of these Bantu Authority Territories, thus providing employment for Bantu across the border, where they are living in their own country with their families, in their own homes, under their own form of government.

131. The Government of the Republic is meanwhile undertaking the task and the expense of developing the Bantu territories; for example, irrigation projects, fencing and soil erosion. The younger Bantu are being instructed in the latest agricultural methods and are being provided with stud cattle to improve their herds. I would add that the Bantu areas are in no way inferior to the corresponding areas occupied by Whites, and in fact in some cases—particularly in the eastern Transvaal—they are superior and able to support a larger population per acre than in most other parts of South Africa.

132. A commissioner-general for each of the ethnic groups serves as a link between the Government of the Republic and the relevant Territorial Authority. He must reside at the headquarters of the Territorial Authority, and it is his duty to bring to the attention of the central government the political, economic and social needs of the ethnic group to which he has been assigned. It should be emphasized that the commissioner-general is not an administrator but that his post is analogous to that of an ambassador to another country.

133. I would add here that, in order to accelerate the transfer of administrative and judicial functions to the recognized leaders of the Bantu, special schools have been established and more are in the process of being established, in the different ethnic areas, for the training of young men who are likely to be leaders of their people, in modern methods of administration and also in economic and business principles. These are facts which are not known to those who attack South Africa.

134. I come now to the position of the urban Bantu. There are 2.5 million Bantu who work and live in the European urban areas. Another 3 million are scattered in other European areas. It has been urged here and elsewhere that they should receive full political equality with the Whites. I have already explained that the Bantu who live in the White areas will retain their voting rights in the self-governing areas from which they come, and they can return there for that purpose, as is done by many of the 400,000 Bantu from the neighbouring British Protectorate of Basutoland who are working in the Republic. In passing I would mention that there are altogether about 1 1/3 million Bantu who are not of South African origin. Our policy aims at maintaining the unity of each of the Bantu ethnic groups, whether living in their homelands or living in the urban areas. It regards the Bantu living in the European area as part of the particular ethnic community in the Bantu homelands. This policy is appreciated by the Bantu themselves and leads to a greater measure of co-operation with the Government in the European area.

135. It is, however, recognized that provision must be made for Bantu living in cities and in the large towns to have a voice in municipal and other local affairs which affect their living conditions. The system of advisory boards which has been in practice for decades was recently extended so that the Bantu in urban residential areas will now be able to form urban councils to which are entrusted specific duties and responsibilities.

136. While on the subject of urban Bantu, I would repeat that the 1 1/3 million Bantu from neighbouring territories who have come to live in South Africa evidently do not mind the alleged oppression. On the contrary, they share in the many benefits—for example, social and medical services, housing and education—provided by the Government of South Africa and by municipal authorities for their own South African non-White citizens. One of our problems is to deal with the continually increased crossing of natives from other neighbouring territories into South Africa who want to come there to be oppressed!

137. One hears and reads much of illiteracy. This is not only an African problem. It is found also in many Western countries and is rife, I understand, in the Middle East and in some Asian countries. I need hardly remind the Assembly of conditions existing in many of the independent African States. Having had experience of the way in which false information is spread about my own country, I do not unreservedly accept what I read about other countries. It is, however, interesting to note that more than one book, authoritatively written, dealing with conditions in two of the oldest independent African States, namely Liberia and Ethiopia, tells of the appalling state of living conditions and also of illiteracy among the masses in those States. Even more interesting is the fact that it is these two States that have taken proceedings against South Africa in the International Court of Justice in which *inter alia* the Republic is charged with not having promoted to the utmost the welfare of the inhabitants of South West Africa!

138. In fairness I must point out that illiteracy is a feature not only of Liberia and Ethiopia. According to a literacy map of the world, only a few African States or territories show an illiteracy rate below 80 per cent. I may add that the South African Bantu

have an illiteracy rate well below that figure: namely, 65 per cent.

139. The great progress made in Bantu education in South Africa is considerably in advance of that made by many other African countries. The success obtained is due to the fact that an educational system has been evolved which recognizes that educational methods designed for European or American children cannot simply be grafted on to the methods used for African children who have grown up under entirely different circumstances. In most cases these children are acquainted only with values, interests and behaviour patterns learned from a Bantu mother and more often than not are living in surroundings still in an early stage of civilization. Too often, missionaries from Europe or America have tried to transplant their systems of education to African countries, with very unsatisfactory results. That mistake has been avoided in the system employed in South Africa, with the result that about 80 per cent of Bantu children in South Africa up to the age of fourteen years are attending 7,412 primary schools. Eight years ago the percentage was only 58.

140. But similar progress has also been made in the secondary or higher schools which are providing higher education to almost 50,000 pupils. There are forty-eight institutions for the training of 4,500 teachers, and also thirty technical schools where at present 1,850 young Bantu are being trained. There are 27,800 teachers in Bantu schools, of whom only about 1 per cent are Whites. This year at least 10,500 Bantu students will be writing the standard VIII (junior certificate) examination, and 2,000 will be taking the matriculation examination, which is necessary for entrance to a university.

141. Also in the field of higher education considerable progress has been made. There are three Bantu university colleges where at present 1,580 students are enrolled.

142. In accordance with South Africa's policy of separate development, the primary and secondary schools are controlled by Bantu parents—and not by Whites—who serve on 500 school boards and 4,500 school committees.

143. Finally, there are also Bantu agricultural schools where training is provided to enable the Bantu to improve their agricultural methods.

144. I suggest that the progress made in South Africa in the field of Bantu primary, secondary and university education far exceeds that of any other African State or territory. And yet, the leaders of those States accuse the South African Government of neglecting, and even of oppressing, the Bantu people.

145. I have referred to political and economic conditions prevailing in most of the States and territories of Central and North Africa—conditions of political unrest and of economic instability. By contrast, there is peace, prosperity and economic stability in South Africa, in spite of attempts by agitators and subversive elements, inside and outside of South Africa, to stir up trouble among the non-Whites and to harm South Africa's economy. Inside South Africa there are subversive Bantu organizations, aided and abetted by certain overseas ultra-liberalistic organizations, such as the American Committee on Africa in New York and Christian Action in London, and by certain sections of the Press in those countries. They are further actively encouraged by the leaders of certain

African States. An interesting feature of this latter type of encouragement is that it is an important factor in the keen competition among certain leaders to assume the leadership of the African States. In bidding for that honour, the idea is that the one that hits South Africa hardest is likely to gain the favour of the smaller African States. The leaders are of course not really worried about the Bantu in South Africa because they know that they are far better cared for and better treated than the masses in their own countries.

146. We firmly believe that the course upon which we have embarked in South Africa will ultimately solve the problem of relations between White and non-White races in our country. It is a policy which aims at progressively giving to the Bantu the complete control of his own homelands and which, by means of urban councils, will provide the urban Bantu with the means to promote their material welfare and social needs. Similar steps have been taken and will be further developed also in the cases of the Coloured and the Indian population. At the same time, this policy will ensure to South Africans of European descent control of their homeland, which over the past three centuries has been opened up and developed by their forebears and by succeeding generations of white South Africans.

147. In conclusion, I want to say that we believe this policy of peaceful but separate coexistence will provide the solution of our racial problems and ensure the happiness and prosperity of all South Africans—White, Black, Coloured and Indian.

148. All that we ask is that we be permitted to carry out our policy of looking after the interests of our Bantu and other non-European peoples without interference from outside, be it from Western, Eastern or African countries.

149. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): By way of exception and in view of the special circumstances I shall call on the representative of Ghana to exercise his right of reply, and I shall then give the floor to the representative of Costa Rica.

150. I first call on the representative of Liberia on a point of order.

151. Mr. Henry Food COOPER (Liberia): As the General Assembly is master of its rules, I move that the whole speech of the representative of South Africa be deleted from the official records of this Assembly. It is an insult to every African here, and not only to every African, but to every man of intelligence. The whole speech is fictitious, and for him to come here and say that the Bantu tribe in Africa approves of everything the South African Government does is beyond human reason.

152. I am reminded of a story of a boy who asked his father why it was that every time he saw a picture of a lion and a man, the man was killing the lion. The father told his son: remember, the man is painting the picture, but let the lion one day get the opportunity to paint the picture and you will see what it will be. And that is what I would say in the case of South Africa.

153. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): May I ask the representative of Liberia whether this is a formal motion which I am to put to a vote? It seems that the representative of Liberia has just answered in the affirmative.

154. I call on the representative of Ethiopia on the point of order made by the representative of Liberia.

155. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia): The representative of Liberia, Mr. Cooper, has saved me from taking the Assembly's time to reply in detail to a racist representative. Let me say, however, lest people should go away with the wrong impression, that everything he said is untrue. I am bound to say that all these statements made by the representative of South Africa, from beginning to end, are calculated to turn the Assembly's attention from the real problem in South Africa itself. Besides making comparisons that have absolutely no value whatever, he has seen fit to insult all of us. Since it saves my delegation from replying to him—which, by the way, would be quite useless because he has a closed mind from beginning to end—I fully support the motion of the representative of Liberia.

156. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Does anyone wish to speak on the Liberian representative's proposal that the statement by the representative of South Africa should not appear in the record?

157. The representative of Ghana has the floor on the Liberian proposal.

158. Mr. ADJEI (Ghana): I should like to say right away that I support the motion put forward by the representative of Liberia. I never thought that this rostrum could be used by any representative of a Member State to indulge in such invective or to reduce the level of our deliberations to such depths in the way it has been used by the Foreign Minister of South Africa. Of course, this is a clear demonstration of the sort of mentality that is now developing in the Union of South Africa, which calls itself the Republic of South Africa.

159. I do not wish to consume much time, but the Foreign Minister of South Africa referred to the statement I made here on 26 September [1015th meeting]. In that statement I said quite clearly that a certain danger is beginning to develop, at first imperceptibly but now in a highly demonstrative manner. It is that the Union of South Africa, which calls itself a republic—and we challenge that—has, for the first time in the history of this Organization, started a practice which in our view constitutes a very dangerous precedent. The Union of South Africa has described a statement made by a representative of a Member State in this Assembly as "objectionable and obscene literature". That is the important point, and I said in my statement that the Government of South Africa had specifically declared the statement made by my President, Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, to this Assembly on 23 September 1960 to be "objectionable literature". And I went on further to say that that statement made by President Nkrumah appeared in United Nations official document A/PV.869.^{2/}

160. Anybody in the Union of South Africa who is found in possession of a copy of this United Nations document commits an offence, and when he is found guilty of that offence he is to be fined £1,000 or approximately \$3,000, or he is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

161. Mr. Louw, the Foreign Minister of South Africa, was trying to pull wool over the eyes of the representatives here. He referred to this paper—a copy

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 869th meeting.

of which I have in my hand—which was circulated by the delegation of Ghana. It is true that the delegation of Ghana did print the address of Osgayefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, even before it was delivered here, so that representatives could avail themselves of copies of it. It is printed in both English and French.

162. It is true that copies of this document circulated by the delegation of Ghana have found their way into the Union of South Africa, but that is not the point. The official Government Gazette, to which I referred in my statement on 26 September, and which in fact Mr. Louw, the Foreign Minister of South Africa, has admitted, is quite clear in its terms. It says this:

"In terms of sub-section (3) of section twenty-one of the Customs Act, 1955 (Act No. 55 of 1955), I, JOHANNES DE KLERK, Minister of the Interior, declare the undermentioned publications to be indecent, obscene or objectionable:"^{3/}

Then the documents are listed, and the first on the list—and I would emphasize that this is the official Government Gazette of South Africa—is:

"Address by Osgayefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, President of the Republic of Ghana, to the Fifteenth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations—23rd September, 1960."

163. The official Government Gazette of South Africa did not refer to the document I have in my hand, which is a printed copy of the Nkrumah statement in the Assembly last year. Nor did it refer to the United Nations document to which I referred—document A/PV.869. The official Government Gazette of South Africa states quite clearly—and every small child will understand the simple English—"Address by Osgayefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, President of the Republic of Ghana". "If you are found with that address"—the Gazette did not say "If you are found with President Nkrumah's address as circulated by the delegation of Ghana", or, "If you are found with President Nkrumah's address as recorded in the official United Nations records"—all that the Gazette refers to is the address of Osgayefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, President of the Republic of Ghana, of 23 September 1960, in whatever document it is recorded. In my statement I made it quite clear that this referred to any document containing President Nkrumah's speech.

164. It is true that this official document of the General Assembly does not contain Dr. Nkrumah's speech alone. It contains speeches made by representatives of other Member States. But any person in possession of any document—whether a United Nations document or a document circulated by the delegation of Ghana—commits an offence if that document contains the speech of Dr. Nkrumah made to the Assembly. And the publication, whatever it is and whatever its origin—again whether it is the United Nations official record or the printed text circulated by the delegation of Ghana—is "obscene", it is "indecent" and it is classified as "objectionable literature".

165. In our view this is a danger that faces the United Nations. It is impudence on the part of a Member State to describe any statement made by the representative of another Member State in this Assembly as "obscene", as "indecent" and as "ob-

jectionable literature", and for the Union of South Africa to declare a United Nations document or any document containing a speech or statement made by a representative in this Assembly to be "obscene", "indecent" and "objectionable" is, we think, serious.

166. That is why, agreeing with my friend the Foreign Minister of Senegal, the delegation of Ghana holds the view and still insists that this Assembly is entitled to call upon the representative of the Union of South Africa, Mr. Louw, to come to this rostrum and show cause why the Union of South Africa and its delegation should not be expelled from membership in the United Nations.

167. There are other nonsensical statements made by Mr. Louw and I will not drag myself to his level to answer him. He talks of Ghana being an authoritarian State. All I want to tell Mr. Louw is that he should come to Ghana to see what happens there. Ghana is the only country perhaps in the world today, shall we say, where races live together in peace and in harmony and in tranquillity, and I am making due allowance for other countries like Brazil in South America and other places.

168. Let Mr. Louw come to Ghana to learn what it is to live with human beings. He will realize that there are no laws segregating human beings in Ghana on the basis of race or colour. There are no laws requiring human beings to carry passes before they are able to move about freely in the course of their normal avocations. Mr. Louw and his colleagues in South Africa have a lot to learn. The African States have a lot to teach them if only they are prepared to learn. But perhaps the intelligence is not there.

169. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call on the representative of Australia on a point of order.

170. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia): We have just heard a very important proposal put forward by the representative of Liberia. Before stating my point of order, perhaps I might just briefly explain my own attitude so that it will not be misunderstood here. The proposal of the representative of Liberia is that the statement that has just been made by the Minister of External Affairs of South Africa should be expunged from the record. The ground for that is that the Minister from South Africa has expressed views that are not merely fundamentally opposed by most representatives here but offend their consciences.

171. As far as Australia is concerned we have made it abundantly clear on many occasions that many of the basic elements of South African policy are not policies which we condone. However, the proposal of the representative of Liberia raises very serious considerations, not in relation to South Africa but in relation to the position of all of us here on all questions. If it were adopted, it would do two things. It would lay down the precedent that a statement by a sovereign Government in this Organization can be expunged merely because other Members of the Organization are opposed to it.

172. That is a very serious step. Many statements have been made in this body with which most of us disagree. They may have been made in very violent language, sometimes in language that is personally offensive. But except where the President calls people to order these have not been expunged. Now if we adopt the present motion, which I think is unprecedented in the plenary meeting, we will have expunged some-

^{3/} Union of South Africa, Government Gazette, vol. CCIV, No. 6694 (26 May 1961), p. 9.

thing because we disagree with it. We will have expunged a statement by a sovereign Government, and I think that is a very important thing for us to bear in mind. If we are opposed to something, then we can act in a substantive way in a debate.

173. In point of fact most of the material which the Minister of External Affairs of South Africa has put before us today covers matters which are before the Assembly in various ways on agenda items and the Assembly will have an opportunity to express its view on the substance of these matters when the items are discussed. In point of fact it will be a much more effective way of expressing an opinion.

174. The second point I would like to make is this. When the United Nations discusses a matter it is most important that it has before it the position of the parties on whatever question is raised. In order to criticize the position of South Africa it is necessary to have before one a statement of the position of South Africa. And to put it in a rather blunt form to some representatives here, how is one going to attack a statement by the Government of South Africa if that statement does not appear in the records, if that statement has been expunged from the records?

175. These are, I submit, important considerations, but they go far beyond the question of whether or not we approve of the policy of the Government of South Africa. I think this should be weighed carefully. I notice that at the present hour—1.25 p.m.—a large number of leaders of delegations and permanent representatives are not here and I think that a matter of such wide significance to the whole working of the United Nations—not now, but in the future—deserves some thought. I would therefore ask that perhaps our decision on this could be postponed, and I think that the representative of Liberia, who himself has great experience in these matters, might also be willing to have the consideration of this fundamental point postponed until another meeting, and he perhaps might raise it on a subsequent occasion. If it is put to the vote now, I am afraid I could not support it because it is a fundamental decision on the whole working of this Organization, not related to South Africa only.

176. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Does the representative of Liberia agree with the proposal just made by the representative of Australia to defer a decision on his motion until a later meeting?

177. Mr. Henry Ford COOPER (Liberia): I am afraid that I cannot agree with the representative of Australia. Here is a country that has defied every resolution of the United Nations, flouted every decision taken here. If everything is so good in South Africa, why do they not permit a delegation from the United Nations to go there?

178. The Australian representative has said that the speech should form a part of the record on the ground that if it is not a part of the record we will not be able to answer South Africa. But if it is not a part of the record, we need not answer it. There is nothing to answer. Mr. President, as far as my Government is concerned, I should be pleased if you would put the motion to the vote.

179. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The representative of Liberia is accordingly pressing his motion to a vote. Since the motion itself relates to a point of order, I shall only call on those speakers

who have something to say on the motion itself. The exercise of the right of reply will come later.

180. I call on the representative of Uruguay on the point of order.

181. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): I have asked the President to be so good as to allow me to come to this rostrum to speak on behalf of my delegation, since I am Chairman of the Committee on South West Africa established by the General Assembly. There are two points to which I wish to refer. One of them concerns the exercise of my right of reply as Chairman of the Committee on South West Africa, in accordance with the rules of procedure. The other concerns the matter which the President has asked us to consider, namely the proposal put forward by the Liberian representative.

182. If I have understood this proposal correctly, it is a request that the speech made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Government of South Africa, which is also the Government of the Mandatory Power responsible for the Territory under international jurisdiction known as South West Africa, should not appear in the official record of this meeting. If that is so, I cannot support the Liberian representative's proposal. There are several reasons for this. One is a reason of principle: the official records should be an exact account of our proceedings. As the representative of Australia has just pointed out, the representatives here are the spokesmen of Governments of Member States and express their opinions as Governments in the General Assembly. This is one reason. The other reason, which I wish to put forward on my own behalf and as Chairman of the Committee on South West Africa, is that I think it right, useful and necessary that the speech by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the South African Government which we have heard this morning should be included in the official records. This speech constituted a fresh defence of the apartheid law. The voice we heard in this speech challenges the conscience of the world. What the representative of the South African Government, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Mandatory Power for South West Africa, said in his statement is an accurate expression of his thought, spoken in his own words. Everyone speaks with his own words. And the words we have heard here once again are those of a Government which has ignored and rejected the General Assembly's jurisdiction in the question of South West Africa on so many different occasions. It has rejected the Security Council's jurisdiction and refused to recognize the opinions given by the International Court of Justice at the request of the General Assembly. It has prevented Committees of the General Assembly from discharging the duties with which the General Assembly had entrusted them in its resolutions and has set itself up as the one law, the one voice, the one opinion and the one authority which can invalidate all the resolutions of the General Assembly, all the resolutions of the Security Council and the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice.

183. Quite apart from the question of principle, and apart from the absolute right of any representative to speak here on behalf of his Government in words dictated by his Government, is not this a sufficient reason why the speech should be included in the official records of this meeting? It will then be clear to the future that today it was still necessary to fight

for the principles of human solidarity and social dignity set forth in Article 1 of the United Nations Charter and that there were still distinguished men like the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Government of South Africa who openly impugned those principles.

184. For these reasons my delegation will not vote in favour of the Liberian representative's proposal; and, if this opinion of ours has any weight or meaning or value to our distinguished colleagues from Liberia—who are also our colleagues in the Committee—I should like the Liberian delegation itself to consider the principle that everything said at this rostrum should be published in the official records and, for this reason and all the others I have given, not to press its proposal and thus not to place us in the position of having to oppose it in the voting. I therefore support the South African representative's right to have what he has said at this rostrum included in the official records.

185. Moreover, if I may be allowed to do so—and here I must consult the President and abide by his decision—I should like to reply briefly to the reference that was made to myself. If the President will allow me, I shall do so now; otherwise I shall do so later.

186. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I shall ask the representative of Uruguay to reserve his right of reply until we have ruled on the point of order raised by the representative of Liberia. I shall call on the representative of Nigeria on that point of order, but I shall first give the floor to the representative of Nepal on a new point of order.

187. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): In view of the lateness of the hour, I should like, under rule 119 of the rules of procedure, to move the adjournment of this meeting.

188. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): A formal motion for adjournment has been made under rule 119 of the rules of procedure. In accordance with that rule, the motion must be put to the vote immediately. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Ceylon, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada.

Against: Cuba, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroun, Central African Republic.

Abstaining: Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Cambodia.

The motion for adjournment was adopted by 51 votes to 31, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.